

Applicants respectfully submit that there are at least two factors which individually and collectively support Applicants' position that there would not appear to be a "serious burden" in examining claims directed to each of the inventions identified by the Examiner.


Firstly, as indicated in the first paragraph above, of the fourteen (14) pending claims, twelve (12) read on the elected invention. Thus, after restriction, only two (2) of the original claims would be withdrawn from consideration of the merits of Applicants' invention.

Secondly, it would appear that the search for the inventions identified by the Examiner would be coextensive. Therefore, if the Examiner were to perform a search for the invention of claims 2-7 and 9-14, it would not appear to be a serious burden to continue the examination of the remaining invention in this application. It would not appear to be a serious burden, when searching for the digital processing system of invention II, to also search for its applicability with facsimile machines, as indicated by claims 1 and 8 of invention I.

Therefore, due to an apparent lack of a serious burden, as recognized in M.P.E.P. 803 as being a prerequisite to a proper restriction requirement, and due to the fact that the Office action fails to even address the issue of a serious burden, Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the restriction requirement be reconsidered and withdrawn. Any comments or questions concerning this application can be directed to the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

July 30, 2004
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

Respectfully submitted,
Kyoji SAITO

Reg. No. 29,027
Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027